

REMARKS

The Office Action dated October 7, 2003 has been reviewed and its contents carefully noted.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 3, 4, 5, 6 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gale et al (US 5692820).

Re Claim 3:

The Examiner states in the office action dated October 7, 2003 on page 8 the following:

Gale et al does disclose reflecting the computer image from the non-transmissive screen towards the first operator location because the projector of Gail projects images that Gail says are being viewed on a persons desk (Col 2 lines 9 and 29, Col 6 lines 50-56).

Gale does teach projecting a computer image from a non-transmissive surface, such as a mirror, towards the first operator location (Col 2, line 9) through a transmissive screen connected to an enclosure housing one or more mirrors (Col 2, line 29). Gale teaches that the computer image in their invention of the projection monitor has to travel through a transmissive screen before reaching the first operator location.

Gale et al teaches that conventional projector designed to be used with a non-transmissive screen (Col 6, lines 55-56) in the presentation manner could be adapted to be used for the projection monitor of Gale.

As explained previously, the projector 560 employs a plurality of single crystal silicon light valve matrices and an optical geometry for producing high resolution color (or monochrome) images. The resulting images are directed through a zoom or fixed focal length projection lens 572 to form an image beam capable of being front or back projected onto a viewing surface or screen (Gale et al Col 6, line 50-56).

In this example of conventional projector application describe above and in Fig. 4, Gale does not anticipate a first operator location or reflecting the computer image, as taught by

Haile-mariam, from the non-transmissive screen towards the first operator location, within a personal workspace in a spatially confined space.

Gale does not anticipate a new method of creating a projection monitor, as taught by Haile-mariam, based on reflecting the computer image from a non-transmissive reflective screen directly towards the first operator location, without passing through a transmissive screen. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3 is respectfully requested.

In light of these new supporting arguments for independent claim 3, dependent claims 4, 5, and 6 being dependent upon and further limiting the independent claim, should also be allowable for that reason, as well as the additional recitations they contain.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Re Claim 24:

The Examiner states in the office action dated October 7, 2003 on page 9 the following:

...the recitation an eye strain reduction method has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See In re Hirao, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and Kropa v. Robie, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951)

Claims 24 has been amended to overcome this rejection by adding another final step that further clarify the eyestrain reduction method of Haile-mariam, as described below.

...directing the path of the projected computer image from the projector to the non-transmissive reflective screen to the operator at the first operator location such that the path distance traveled, X, is greater than the distance, Y, of the path of the computer image from a non-projection computer monitor positioned on a desk to the operator at the same first operator location, within the same personal workspace.

In accordance with the Endale G. Haile-mariam's Computer Eyestrain Theory, articulating an additional final step illustrates more clearly that light carrying the image has to experience reflection and travel a longer distance in order to alleviate eyestrain. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 24 is respectfully requested.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 14, 15-18 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gale et al (US 5692820) in view of Rohr (US 4708312).

Re Claim 14:

As described above, Gale does not disclose an adjustable arm. Gale et al in view of Rohr does disclose directing a projector, supported by an adjustable arm, to project a computer image to a non-transmissive reflective screen. The Examiner states in the office action dated June 4, 2003 on page 9 the following:

Gale et al in view of Rohr does disclose directing a projector to project a computer image while the projector is on an adjustable arm because the adjustable arm of Rohr is disclosed as being capable of holding a video display apparatus or projection monitor (Rohr Col 1, line 9-10) such as the one disclosed by Gale et al as noted above.

In addition, Examiner states in the office action dated October 7, 2003 on page 9 the following:

Applicant's argument fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Gale et al in view of Rohr does render obvious the use of a video display apparatus like a projector to be used in the prior art form or in the presentation manner, with the support of an adjustable arm. Gale et al in view of Rohr does render obvious the use of the projection monitor of Gale with the support of an adjustable arm. Gale in view of Rohr does not render obvious a new method of creating a projection monitor, as taught by Haile-mariam, based on reflecting the computer image, produced by a projector mounted on an adjustable arm, from the non-transmissive reflective screen towards the first operator location, within the personal workspace. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14 is respectfully requested.

In light of these new supporting arguments for independent claim 14, dependent claims 15, 16, 17 and 18 being dependent upon and further limiting the independent

claim, should also be allowable for that reason, as well as the additional recitations they contain. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Re Claim 30:

Gale et al in view of Rohr does disclose directing a projector, supported by an adjustable arm, to project a computer image to a non-transmissive reflective screen. Gale et al in view of Rohr does render obvious an eyestrain reduction method based on the use of the projection monitor of Gale, with the support of an adjustable arm. However, Gale et al in view of Rohr does not render obvious a new eyestrain reduction method, as taught by Haile-mariam, of operating a computer based on reflecting the computer image, produced by a projector mounted on an adjustable arm, from the non-transmissive reflective screen towards the first operator location, within a personal workspace.

In addition, Claims 30 has been amended to overcome this rejection by adding another final step that further clarify the eyestrain reduction process of Haile-mariam, as described below.

...directing the path of the projected computer image from the projector, on an adjustable arm, to the non-transmissive reflective screen to the operator at the first operator location such that the path distance traveled, X, is greater than the distance, Y, of the path of the computer image from a non-projection computer monitor positioned on a desk to the operator at the same first operator location, within the same personal workspace.

In accordance with Endale G. Haile-mariam's Computer Eyestrain Theory, articulating an additional final step illustrates more clearly that light carrying the image has to experience reflection and travel a longer distance in order to alleviate eyestrain. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 30 is respectfully requested.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103

Claims 3-6, 14-18, 24 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as obvious over Nasserbakht (US 5,658,063).

Re Claim 3:

Nasserbakht discloses a projector, reflective screen and computer. The computer could be desktop computer, workstation, laptop, notebook, sub-notebook, processor integrated keyboard or other computer system. Nasserbakht does not anticipate or render obvious a new method of creating a projection monitor, as taught by Haile-mariam, based on reflecting the computer image, generated by a computer, from the non-transmissive reflective screen towards the first operator location.

Nasserbakht also discloses a projector in Fig. 4 projecting a presentation slide used in the presentation manner. Fig. 4 does not illustrate a desk or any other drawing that would anticipate or render obvious positioning a projector on a desk with a personal workspace that is spatially confined. Nasserbakht [Col 4, 47-49] teaches a projector of Fig. 4 could be used with the retractable screen as in Fig. 2. Nasserbakht teaches in Fig. 2 that the retractable screen provides a screen to show presentation slides in the presentation manner. Nasserbakht [Col 3, 62-66] the retractable screen has telescope legs providing variable distance and the screen itself maybe flexible or have plurality of slidable slats for the purpose of having larger screen sizes suitable for small presentations. The retractable screen maybe housed inside the storage of a notebook computer. The projector in Fig. 4 is connected to a desktop computer. It is common knowledge that laptop and desktop computers, as well as other kinds of computers, are typically used with prior art projectors for presentations in conference rooms or other meeting locations. Nasserbakht does not illustrate, anticipate, or render obvious a new method of creating a projection monitor, as taught by Haile-mariam, based on reflecting the computer image from a non-transmissive reflective screen towards a first operator location, within a personal workspace.

Nasserbakht describes an application of his invention below. The invention is a projection system capable producing digital video images that are sharp, completely focused and easy on the eyes.

In another embodiment of the present invention the projection system is part of a projection display unit which is in communication with a desktop computer.

It is often that we have a desktop computer or laptop in communication with a prior art projector used in a conference room. An image that is more in focus or has better image quality is easier for viewers watching a presentation. A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time would find it obvious for some kind of screen to exist for projector of Nasserbakht described above. Nasserbakht does not anticipate or render obvious a desk or positioning the projector on a desk. Nasserbakht does not anticipate or render obvious a first operator location, as taught by Haile-mariam, arranged in proximity to the positioning of the projector itself within the personal workspace having a spatially confined area. Nasserbakht does not anticipate or render obvious a new method of creating a projection monitor, as taught by Haile-mariam, based on reflecting the computer image from the non-transmissive reflective screen towards the first operator location, within the personal workspace. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3 is respectfully requested.

In light of these new supporting arguments for independent claim 3, dependent claims 4, 5, and 6 being dependent upon and further limiting the independent claim, should also be allowable for that reason, as well as the additional recitations they contain. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Re Claim 14:

As described above, Nasserbakht does disclose a reflective screen and a projector. Rohr does disclose an adjustable arm. Nasserbakht does not anticipate or render obvious a desk or positioning the projector on a desk.

Nasserbakht in view of Rohr does disclose directing a projector, supported by an adjustable arm, to project a computer image to a reflective screen. Nasserbakht in view of Rohr does not anticipate or render obvious a first operator location, as taught by Haile-mariam, arranged in proximity to the positioning of the projector itself within the personal workspace having a spatially confined area. Nasserbakht in view of Rohr does not anticipate or render obvious a new method of creating a projection monitor, as taught by Haile-mariam, based on reflecting the computer image, produced by a projector mounted on an adjustable arm, from the non-transmissive reflective screen towards the first operator location, within the personal workspace. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14 is respectfully requested.

In light of these new supporting arguments for independent claim 14, dependent claims 15, 16, 17 and 18 being dependent upon and further limiting the independent claim, should also be allowable for that reason, as well as the additional recitations they contain. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Re Claim 24:

As described above, Nasserbakht does disclose a projector and a reflective screen. Nasserbakht teaches directing the projector towards the reflective screen. Nasserbakht does not anticipate or render obvious a desk or positioning the projector on a desk.

Nasserbakht anticipates or render obvious an eyestrain reduction method of operating a computer based on the projection system of Nasserbakht because using the Nasserbakht projector instead of a conventional computer monitor reduces eyestrain. Nasserbakht teaches using the projector in the prior art form or in the presentation manner reducing eyestrain for the audience and not an operator at the first operator location, as taught by Haile-mariam. Nasserbakht does not anticipate or render obvious a first operator location, as taught by Haile-mariam, arranged in proximity to the positioning of the projector itself within the personal workspace having a spatially confined area. Nasserbakht does not anticipate or render obvious an eyestrain reduction method of operating a computer, as taught by Haile-mariam, based on reflecting the computer image from the non-transmissive reflective screen towards the first operator location, within the personal workspace. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 24 is respectfully requested.

Re Claim 30:

As described above, Nasserbakht does disclose a projector and a reflective screen. Rohr does disclose an adjustable arm. Nasserbakht does not anticipate or render obvious a desk or positioning the projector on a desk. Nasserbakht in view of Rohr does disclose directing a projector, supported by an adjustable arm, to project a computer image to a reflective screen.

Nasserbakht in view of Rohr anticipates an eyestrain reduction method of operating a computer based on the projection system of Nasserbakht because using Nasserbakht projector, with the adjustable arm, instead of a conventional computer monitor reduces eyestrain. Nasserbakht in view of Rohr anticipates or render obvious using the projector in the prior art form or in the presentation manner, with the adjustable arm, reducing eyestrain for the audience and not for an operator at the first operator location, as taught by Haile-mariam. Nasserbakht in view of Rohr does not anticipate or render obvious a first operator location, as taught by Haile-mariam, arranged in proximity to the positioning of the projector itself within the personal workspace having a spatially confined area. Nasserbakht does not anticipate or render obvious an eyestrain reduction method of operating a computer, as taught by Haile-mariam, based on reflecting the computer image, produced by a projector mounted on an adjustable arm, from the non-transmissive reflective screen towards the first operator location, within the personal workspace. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 30 is respectfully requested.

I respectfully request a timely notice of allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 5, 2004



Endale G. Haile-mariam
2712 Henderson Ave
Wheaton, MD 20902
P: (301) 962-9220
F: (301) 962-8126